

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated June 6, 2007 (“Office Action”). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-6 and 8-18 were pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-6 and 8-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,732,078 issued to Arango (hereinafter “*Arango*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

There is a multitude of reasons why the cited reference cannot inhibit the patentability of Independent Claim 1. For example, *Arango* fails to teach “...building an entry in a flow cache, the routing device generating an accounting record for the first message and determining an encryption treatment for the first message; identifying a second one message of said first plurality of messages; routing said second one message responsive to said first routing treatment,” as is recited in Independent Claim 1.

The Examiner’s contention is that these limitations are found in Column 11 of *Arango*, but that is simply mistaken. First, *Arango* fails to offer the actual generation of an entry in a flow cache. A cache is a component that is subsequently referenced in order to expedite processing of future packets, which is why it is important to actually build the entry when the data is not already provided there. Second, *Arango* fails to actually generate an accounting record. *Arango* does disclose ascertaining which party will pay for the session, but this is not akin to a full accounting record, where packets are tracked or a cumulative number of bytes are systematically recorded. [See Applicant’s Specification at page 12 for support.] Third, *Arango* fails to route subsequent packets (i.e., said second one message) based on the first routing treatment being recorded. This ties into the first missing limitation, as the recordation of this information is done via the flow cache. *Arango* does not offer any disclosure that would anticipate these three separate limitations.

Therefore, for at least the reasons outlined above, Independent Claim 1 is clearly allowable over the cited reference. All of the other Independent Claims include a similar limitation and, thus, are also allowable over these references for analogous reasons. In

ATTORNEY DOCKET  
062891.0993  
Confirmation No. 2952

PATENT APPLICATION  
09/812,835

6

addition, their respective dependent claims are allowable using a similar rationale. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Applicants believe no fee is due. However, if this is not the case, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Thomas J. Frame at 214.953.6675.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants

  
Thomas J. Frame  
Reg. No. 47,232

Date: September 4, 2007

Customer Number: **05073**